

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 16-24. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-32 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant has amended the claims to correct for statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 16-22, 24-27, and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blakley, III et al (US Publication No. 2004/0128378), herein referred to as Blakley. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims.

The present application solves the problem of continuous registrations and de-registrations of attribute offerings in the Discovery Service Framework when these attributes change very often. Previously the Applicant argued that Blakley failed to disclose the use of an offering trigger.

This problem, among others, is solved by the Attribute Provider registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework intended to request, if needed, the further registration of the attribute offering; the Discovery Service Framework processing the offering registration trigger upon request for the attribute offering received from an Attribute Requestor and requesting the registration of the attribute offering to the Attribute Provider as a result of processing the offering registration trigger; the Attribute Provider registering the attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework; and the Discovery Service Framework providing the attribute offering to the Attribute Requestor which requested the attribute offering.

Following this, the Attribute Requestor in the present application may access the Attribute Provider indicated by the attribute offering.

The present application thus provides for a mechanism where attribute offerings need not be registered and de-registered from the Discovery Service as the attributes change, but the offering registration 'triggers' in the Discovery Service Framework requests the registration of any particular attribute offering to the Attribute Provider only when requested from an Attribute Requestor.

The Blakley reference uses some of the same terminology as the Applicant and is in the same field as the Applicant. But, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Blakley reference fails to disclose a trigger of any kind and it appears that the Examiner is pulling together different phrases in Blakley to attempt to construct an equivalent of the trigger limitation disclosed in the Applicant's present application. For instance, in claim 1, the portion of Blakley cited against the limitation of the registration trigger is characterized as equivalent to "authentication of data which triggers the process ...". But, Applicant's claim 2 discloses the registration trigger being the same for all users, which in an authentication process would appear to defeat authentication. Also, the element regarding registering an offering registration in the DSF is not found in Blakley, only a claim that the cited portion is equivalent. The Applicant respectfully submits that the equivalents that are recited are not equivalent to the Applicant's limitations.

Although the Examiner may give the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner cannot ignore the plain meaning of words in the claims. In addition, each and every element of the claim must be expressly or inherently described in the reference in order to anticipate the claim (see MPEP 2111.01 and 2131). The term 'trigger' in the Applicant's is not disclosed in Blakley nor is registering the offering registration in the DSF.

Contrary to the Examiner's statement that all elements are disclosed in the Blakley reference, at least the elements regarding registering an offering registration trigger and the Attribute Provider registering an attribute offering in the DSF upon request from the DSF are not found in the Blakley reference. So, the rejection of

independent claims 1, 19, 16 and 24 and the respective dependent claims is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 7, 8, 13, 15, 20, 23, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley et al (US Publication No. 2004/0128378 A1) as applied to claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 above, and further in view of Underwood (US Patent No. 6,633,878 B1), herein referred to as Underwood. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant respectfully submits that a person skilled in the art would not look to Underwood to solve the problem of what to do when the attribute offering is withdrawn once the user signs off. The Applicant has reviewed the cited portion of Underwood and respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation and the application of the interpretation. The Underwood reference in columns 76 and 77 is cited against claims 7 and 8 for disclosing the limitation "the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn once the user signs off". The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the language in column 77 that the Examiner recites as clearly saying the sign-off withdraws the triggering event and attribute offering. Underwood is concerned with issue tracking and for initializing a database used with an issue tracker. The sign-off disclosed by Underwood does not indicate withdrawal of a trigger. The portion of Underwood discloses a box that the user checks to indicate that a change request meets the needs of the person that requested the change; i.e., the change has been successfully completed. And the motivation is indicated to be that of capturing changes by the Change Tracking tool, which is not mentioned and has no equivalent in the Applicants application.

Additionally, the Underwood reference does not supply at least the missing limitations of the DSF and trigger found in the independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24. This being the case the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 7, 8, 13, 15, 20, 23, 28 and 29.

Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 10 on page 31 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: May 11, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com